UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

World Sovereignty of Human Rights - - - *Edith Hansen*

The Value-Shy Scientist - *Leah Greenberg*

Silent Night, Holy Night? - *Bethuel Gross*

Man's Changing Universe - *Bruno Lasker*

Two Eminent Individualist-Humanists: Gide and Santayana - *Victor S. Yarros*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVII NUMBER 5

Chicago, November-December, 1951

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Channing M. Briggs: Instructor in Sociology and Group Work, George Williams College, Chicago.

Leah Greenberg: At present working on her doctorate in Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Bethuel Gross: Musician and Student Counselor.

Edith Hansen: Housewife and Member of the Philadelphia Ethical Society.

Bruno Lasker: Research Scientist and Author.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

Dorothy Hopkins Schaad: Office Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, Chicago.

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney and journalist.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 71

ARTICLES—
- World Sovereignty of Human Rights—EDITH HANSEN 72
- The Value-Shy Scientist—LEAH GREENBERG 75
- Silent Night, Holy Night?—BETHUEL GROSS 76
- Man's Changing Universe—BRUNO LASKER 77
- Two Eminent Individualist-Humanists: Gide and Santayana—VICTOR S. YARROS 80

CORRESPONDENCE—
- A Reply to Mr. Turner—SHERMAN D. WAKEFIELD 81

THE STUDY TABLE—
- A Remarkable Frenchman—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 82
- Antidote—CHANNING M. BRIGGS 82
- Common Elements—DOROTHY HOPKINS SCHAAD 82
- Consumption—CHANNING M. BRIGGS 82
- A Broad Discussion—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 82

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 83

THE FIELD—
- Gag Rule at Ohio State—*ACLU Bulletin* 70

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Gag Rule at Ohio State

After widespread protests by the Cleveland Civil Liberties Union, the Cincinnati branch of ACLU and other organizations, the president of Ohio State University, Dr. Howard L. Bevis, has relaxed the gag rule which permits him to screen all speakers visiting the university's campus.

Bevis announced November 8 that three groups of speakers may appear on the campus without prior screening by him: Those (1) invited by faculty members to speak in classes to "make a proper contribution to classwork"; (2) heads of religious organizations recognized on the campus; (3) speakers invited by off-campus organizations recognized by the university.

The OSU gag rule had raised widespread protest. In a letter to each of the trustees, the Cleveland unit's chairman, O. H. Steiner, stated that "by this action the trustees have assumed to delegate to the president alone the powers to determine what ideas, political, social, or economic, the students of this state-supported institution may have presented for their consideration."

The gag rule came about as the result of a campus talk last summer by Dr. Harold Rugg, professor emeritus of Columbia University and author of textbooks that have been hotly debated across the country. The American Legion protested the speaker's appearance. The Columbus newspapers followed this with an editorial campaign against Dr. Rugg, accusing the university of fostering subversives.

Gov. Frank J. Lausche called for the trustees to investigate. The upshot was the gag rule empowering the president to screen speakers.

In the letter to the trustees, Steiner remarked, "We should like to ask one simple question: Is it the function of the university to train its students to think for themselves —or to hear and remember what they are told? In our view, neither the educational ideas of Dr. Rugg, even though he may be a New Dealer, nor those of Dr. Hinshaw, even though he may be a Quaker

(*Continued on page* 80)

UNITY

Volume CXXXVII NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1951 No. 5

EDITORIAL

It is difficult to understand the motive of the President in nominating an Ambassador to the Vatican. If the Vatican is sincere in its opposition to Communism, it surely would not use such information as it may have to blackmail governments into diplomatic recognition. The one-hundred-and-eight-acre site of the Vatican is the capital of the Roman Catholic Church. It is not a secular state. Its officials are engaged exclusively in fostering the world-wide interests of the Roman Catholic Church. Its representatives throughout the world are committed to obedience to the Pope. The issue of the separation of Church and State is as clear as day. To name an Ambassador to the Vatican is a violation of the American Constitution as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court. It would give preferential treatment to a particular Church. The President cannot possibly be unware of these issues. He was brought up as a Baptist, and he honors the memory of Roger Williams. He has acted democratically and courageously on other controversial issues. I am loath to believe that the voting power of Catholic-dominated cities could have motivated him. And besides, he was in no danger of losing the Catholic votes in the great cities. Could it be that the frontal attack of the Roman Catholic Church on the idea of the separation of Church and State has made headway in high governmental circles? If so, it is time that the Protestants and secularists demanded a showdown in the wide open. The Constitution should not be subverted under the guise of "a listening post" at the Vatican. Most liberals have devoutly hoped that America could avoid a pitched battle with the Roman Catholic Church over its political machinations. All previous skirmishes have been led by the Ku Klux Klan type of mind, and liberals have found it difficult to choose between evils. But today there is a rising tide of opposition to the political aims of the Roman Catholic Church on the part of Protestants and secularists that is led by intellectuals who are committed to the liberal democratic way of life. Liberals will join actively in this battle. And there can be no doubt about the outcome. Protestants and secularists are a vast majority in America, and they will not submit to ecclesiastical control. The wall of separation between Church and State in America must not be breached.

Curtis W. Reese.

World Sovereignty of Human Rights

EDITH HANSEN

Winston Churchill, in 1942, referred to the "enthronement of human rights" which would follow the second World War. The world sovereignty of human rights and freedoms and of total human well-being is emerging unostentatiously, however, in various efforts of many people. It does not rule. But through the United Nations and coöperating international citizens' organizations, it challenges national sovereignty, organized greed, and general ignorance and indifference. And its challenge will continue.

In writing this article, as an ordinary citizen of world viewpoint, I do not assume to present an imperative argument, but a suggestive interpretation. The quotation from Winston Churchill and some historical facts are from *These Rights and Freedoms,* a book published by the UN Department of Public Information. From the *UN Bulletin,* from bulletins of the International League for the Rights of Man and of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and from letters by Roger Baldwin, I have collected a large number of illustrations of the emerging world sovereignty of human rights. Several phases are evident in the emergence: growing world organization of the influence of world-minded individuals in behalf of human rights; growing consciousness among peoples of the basic importance of human rights, with the United Nations assuming, and being pressed to assume, increasing responsibility for the universal well-being of the people of the world; recognition of the advancing world sovereignty of human rights in the verbal expressions of the representatives of nations, with representatives of some less powerful nations championing important rights; growth of the sovereignty of some rights. These phases are interrelated, as is shown in some illustrations selected from the many available ones.

"Who will inherit the earth?" asks Dr. Charles Malik, Minister of Lebanon in the United States and Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights. "Only the people and the country which, overcoming its own internal difficulties, steps forth with courage and humor and responsibility to lead the rest of the world in the effective affirmation of that which essentially belongs to man." Dr. Malik asks and answers his question in his report of the seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights held this spring in Geneva.

Perhaps no one country or people can adequately understand man and mankind. Perhaps intellectual freedom, creative thinking, challenging discussion, and pioneering action must be on a world basis for development of understanding of "that which essentially belongs to man." Does not the necessity of thinking of any one nation—or religion, philosophy, or politico-economic ideology—as mankind's salvation hamper the insight of even the noblest, wisest, and most brilliant individuals? It may be that coöperating world-minded individuals from all possible peoples can best lead the world in understanding and affirmation of the capacities and rights of mankind. Both concern for the total well-being of all humanity and valuing of the worth, dignity, and need for spiritual freedom of every individual are being emphasized in some UN affairs as fitting ideals for intelligent people. Is not the capacity to hold these companion ideals part of "that which essentially belongs to man"? Together, they reach beyond the concept of the greatest good for the largest number—a concept which permits rationalizations of injustices which might be helped. Although repressions are growing and, in different forms and varying degrees, extend nearly everywhere, human rights are being advanced in unexpected places and in surprising ways. The world citizen can boldly affirm the universal concepts of total human well-being and individual worth and need for freedom, while also being conscious of his inability to comprehend them fully. He can cherish hope that somewhere in the world there are, or will be, persons who can contribute to the development of many phases of these inclusive ideals. Strengthened by this hope, he can make effort for the growth, application, and realization of those parts which he understands best.

Innumerable millions of people have contributed to the present world movement for human rights. Efforts leading to it began before the beginning of history. Through the United Nations, diverse aspirations and convictions of value, developed by many peoples, groups, and persons through long ages, have been gathered together into a dynamic whole. Insistence upon a comprehensive program of universal significance, the formulation of statements, and the making of plans for application are achievements of groups and individuals, governmental and non-governmental. Stimulus for development of different parts of the program and moral support are quantitatively in the minds, emotions, and activities of great numbers of people, especially of underprivileged people. This stimulus and moral support are comprehensively illustrated by the comment of the representative of India in the Social, Cultural, and Humanitarian Committee of the General Assembly in 1950. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, she said, had made a tremendous appeal to the peoples of the world. The articles of it had become a battle cry of all oppressed peoples, and anything which might impair the moral force of the Declaration would be a disaster. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is the battle cry of millions, not because all the people value all its provisions, but because every people, group, or person who wants or values any human rights can find something in it that stimulates hope and effort. It is the concise, comprehensive symbol of all the creative aspirations that comprise the growing world sovereignty of human rights. Much that is done in the name of the United Nations deserves doubt and adverse criticism. But the remarkable flexibility of United Nations arrangements, the considerable opportunity for citizen influence in comparison with that provided by national governments now, and formerly by the League of Nations, and the emphasis upon economic, social, and cultural values give vast advantage to human rights, truths, and ideals. The world sovereignty of human rights is a moral sovereignty, living and growing in the souls of world citizens and needy millions. It was because of the influence of representatives of non-governmental organizations that human rights were emphasized in the Charter of the United Nations. The book, *These Rights and Free-*

doms, tells of this influence. And it notes that, in the Charter, "We the peoples of the United Nations" rather than the States declare faith in these rights. This faith influenced proceedings at the seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights. Roger Baldwin, who—representing the International League for the Rights of Man, the ACLU as an affiliate of the ILRM, and the World Federation of United Nations Associations—attended every one of the day-long sessions through five weeks, commented: "The debates have run on a pretty high level of fidelity to principles; every conceivable right was examined from all sides, reflecting a universal awareness of their basic importance, despite conflicting east-west interpretations." The representative of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom was similarly impressed: "The presence of the organizations showed the passionate interest with which millions of people in all parts of the world followed the Commission's work, knowing that the future of mankind would, to a considerable extent, depend on whether the promises made during and after the war, and notably in San Francisco, with regard to respect of human rights would finally be fulfilled."

Interest in the right of petition to the United Nations illustrates the pressure of influence by non-governmental organizations, needy peoples, UN officials, and governmental representatives who are concerned for human rights. Non-governmental organizations have urged repeatedly that individuals and groups, or at least international organizations, be granted the right of petition in cases of violation of rights. During this spring's session of the Commission on Human Rights, India made a motion for such a right of petition, and the non-governmental organizations supported it almost unanimously. But the United States, Britain, France, the USSR, and Nationalist China, guarding national sovereignty, opposed it. Seven "little" countries, led by India, championed it. In the final vote there were seven for, ten against, one abstention. Championship by the seven less powerful nations was an encouragement to the non-governmental organizations to take their fight to the summer session of the Economic and Social Council and to this winter's session of the General Assembly. The less powerful nations have more influence, in comparison with that of the great powers, in the General Assembly than in the Commission on Human Rights. Mr. Baldwin has remarked that in the General Assembly the less powerful nations can challenge more effectively the assumption that only a covenant ratified by the leading democracies can be successfully operated. Representatives of non-governmental organizations lobbied vigorously during the summer and fall for inclusion of the right of petition and for other changes and additions necessary to make the Covenant adequate and workable.

Although the right of petition is not formally recognized, except for people in Trust Territories, an evolution is occurring, aided by UN officials. Complaints made by individuals and groups alleging violations of human rights are brought to the attention of the Commission on Human Rights by the Secretary-General, so directed by the Economic and Social Council. Each Member State is furnished with a copy of communications concerning human rights relating to it or its territories. Replies of Member States are turned over to the Commission on Human Rights. Further illustration of evolution has been the mission of Michael Scott. When he made his second trip to the United Nations to present the petition of native tribes of South-West Africa, requesting that the territory be placed under the Trusteeship System, leaders of more than a dozen non-governmental organizations—international, British, and American—cooperated to bring pressure for a hearing. Dr. Victor Hoo, Assistant-Secretary General in charge of Trusteeship matters, made a statement: "The Fourth Committee, or indeed any other Committee, has the right to invite, if they so wish, any appropriate body or person to give evidence on the subject of which it is seized." In spite of strong opposition, Michael Scott was heard in the Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee in the fall of 1949 and again in 1950. In 1950 he served as Observer and Consultant for the International League for the Rights of Man. Regarding the discussions stimulated by the Reverend Mr. Scott's presentation of the petition in 1949, Miss Gertrude Baer, Consultant with ECOSOC for the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, said:

> A rare sense of moral responsibility and obligation was displayed by many delegates and by the chairman of the Fourth Committee, who handled the often very delicate situation with firmness, impartiality, and great tact. The representatives of Guatemala, India, Mexico, and the Philippines were among those who remained ever alert and fearless, maintaining a high level of political wisdom and farsightedness from the beginning to the very last minute of the proceedings in the Assembly's plenary session.

The Reverend Mr. Scott's testimony and documents which he presented were included with documents of the General Assembly submitted to the International Court of Justice in connection with a request for an advisory opinion on the status of South-West Africa. The opinion of the Court includes a statement that the Union of South Africa has an obligation to transmit to the United Nations petitions from the inhabitants of the Territory.

People in the Trust Territories make more and more use of their right of petition to the Trusteeship Council. Nearly two hundred petitions were considered by it this summer. Also, Visiting Missions from the Council study conditions in the Trust Territories and listen to the complaints and wishes of the people. At this summer's session of the Council, it was decided to issue to indigenous peoples at the time of visits by Visiting Missions this statement:

> The basic objectives of the Trusteeship System are: to further international peace and security; to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of Trust Territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence; to encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world. Our Mission has come to see the conditions under which you live and work, and the progress that has been achieved. It has come to hear what you may wish to say, and to study your problems. We will report to the Trusteeship Council what we have seen and heard.

Of the administering powers in the Trusteeship Council, the United States and New Zealand give strongest support to efforts for giving petitions a more prominent and influential place. José D. Ingles, of the Philippines, always a courageous and able spokesman for native peoples, has emphasized that petitions are the only means by which indigenous populations can obtain a hearing before world opinion, and that the General Assembly should reinforce this link with the peoples of the Trust Territories.

Preponderance of verbal support of human rights

in the General Assembly, Economic and Social Council, and Trusteeship Council demonstrates the inherence and inevitability of the moral sovereignty of human rights in democratic world organization. Sacrifice and violation of human rights may be advantageous or unavoidable in struggles between nations. But in the universal struggle against war, hunger, disease, and oppression, there is a natural pressure of human rights to dominate both ends and means. On the world level there is no permanent escape from recognition of the natural supremacy of human rights. The Charter of the United Nations records recognition of it, and the United Nations has attracted many persons who value the recognition. Governments have sent, as representatives to the United Nations, persons who are interested in its universal purposes or its usefulness to national purposes or both. Whatever the intentions of governments and the interests of their representatives, all members of UN organizations feel the pressure of the needs and aspirations of the underprivileged peoples of the world. Most of the articulate members, whether from dictatorships or democracies, support human rights in discussions. Communist nations vigorously advocate their human rights ideology, which has within it certain concepts of creative value. They do not support a universal moral sovereignty of human rights, implying a continuing revelation through the collective experience of all mankind, with applications through world law democratically formulated. They insist that there should be no interference in the domestic affairs of states. The state is obligated to guarantee rights. Rights are authoritatively formulated, interpreted, and enforced by the power clique. Consequently, some rights tend to become oppressions. However, broadminded representatives of some other nations separate out from Communist ideology concepts of universal value and incorporate them in UN statements and plans. Communist representatives also make valuable specific suggestions which are accepted as made. For example, the phrase *without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion* was included in the statement to be made to people in Trust Territories by Visiting Missions, at the suggestion of Mr. Soldatov of the USSR. The continual goading of Western nations by Communist nations in human rights discussions forces the Western nations to broaden their intentions and to be poignantly conscious of their responsibilities. The United States, on the other hand, leads the Western nations and other nations in attacks upon slave labor, denial of freedoms, and treaty violations involving human rights in the Communist nations. In the conflict, each nation or group of nations contributes to the emphasis upon the world sovereignty of human rights. The ideological contributions of Communist nations have pertained chiefly to economic and social rights, those of Western nations primarily to civil and personal rights—what they call fundamental freedoms. Some representatives of some Asiatic and Latin American nations, however, are the moral prophets among the spokesmen of nations. They champion the causes of the underprivileged in a spirit of universality, condemn the power struggle of the great nations, and insist upon the supreme importance of the well-being of all humanity. Hernan Santa Cruz of Chile, who recently completed his term as president of ECOSOC, was impressed by the agreement upon certain emphases in this summer's session of the Council. This agreement, he said, had not been noticed because of the antagonisms that dominated discussions. All members agreed upon the need for speeding up the economic development of underdeveloped countries, for combatting hunger, slavery, international cartels, and the illicit drug traffic, for achieving land reform in many countries, and for ensuring respect for human dignity. "Peace," he said, "is not an end in itself; it is a means of attaining human happiness. And the economic and social work of the United Nations not only helps to safeguard peace, but is of direct benefit to man by promoting both his material and spiritual welfare."

Significant achievement toward world sovereignty of some human rights is illustrated by the accomplishments of a number of the Specialized Agencies. One of these—the World Health Organization—held its fourth World Health Assembly this spring, with delegations from seventy countries and observers from more than twenty international organizations. It was "perhaps the largest inter-governmental gathering ever held at which firm decisions, binding on the participating countries, were reached on matters of vital importance for the health and welfare of hundreds of millions of people." The new International Sanitary Regulations, on which experts from all over the world have worked many years, govern the health aspects of world commerce and travel. This code defines "the rights of millions of international travellers and protects the many millions more who stay at home." They establish a means for constant review with the possibility of revision when sufficient experience has been gained and when world conditions change. This measure of sovereignty of the right of health is possible because all delegations were "willing to consider the interests not merely of their own countries but also of their neighbors and of the entire world community."

Individuals who feel concern for the advancement of the world sovereignty of human rights will be interested in a group of articles in the August issue of *UN World*, obtainable for 35 cents, 319 East 44 St., New York 17. Among them are remarkable articles by Roger Baldwin, chairman of the Board of the International League for the Rights of Man, and Ben Carruthers, Social Affairs Officer, Division of Human Rights, Department of Social Affairs, UN Secretariat. Dr. Carruthers' article deals primarily with the development and influence upon international and national affairs of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. An extensive new pamphlet, *The Impact of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,* can be obtained from the Department of Public Information, United Nations, New York. It gives a summary of the moral and legal impact of the Declaration upon individuals, organizations, and governments. For continuing acquaintance with the world movement for human rights and for guidance in participation, I urge membership in the International League for the Rights of Man, 756 Seventh Ave., New York 19. It is recognized by the United Nations as the special consultative agency in the field of human rights, and it has affiliates in an enlarging number of countries. "The efforts to build through the United Nations toward ultimate world law based on human rights are highly significant for the future," comments Mr. Baldwin. "The League's role in these efforts is persistent, and, we think, of considerable influence."

The Value-Shy Scientist

LEAH GREENBERG

It is becoming increasingly fashionable for the scientist to divorce himself from any and all tinge of value. To the extent that value judgment is excluded in experimental research and scientific study, this attitude is essential. It becomes a fundamental scientific approach. But when the scientist uses it in *a priori* fashion in all he does and says, he becomes not only rather foolish but commits two blunders: First, he is placed in a position which is antithetical to what he is striving for; and, secondly, such behavior on his part leads to harmful results in the social group of which he is a member.

We all realize that it is the scientist's primary need for being objective that is the basic cause of his value consciousness. Its roots reach back to the seventeenth century when the seeds of modern science were first planted in European soil. In the centuries that followed, this seed developed into a plant. No doubt science received its greatest impetus with the steady refinement of experimental methods. It soon became apparent that if the scientist was to weigh, measure, isolate facts, and establish laws, it was essential for him to exclude carefully all judgment value, and guard against its entering his scales. The matter is much simpler in the physical sciences than in the social. The obvious reason is, of course, that in the latter judgment values are more likely to creep in. When psychology, for example, divorced itself from philosophy, it became clear why it had to be on the lookout for the use of objective methods. The psychologist with the rigorous approach in research has refined his experimental design to an operational status.

True, there have been protests—protests against the inroads of what philosophers have called naturalism and materialism. The idealist Berkeley, and the nineteenth century romantic poets, exemplified by Coleridge, Byron, and Shelley, illustrate such a protest. And this continued protesting voice has persisted right down to the present. But nevertheless the strongest viewpoint to influence our society has been the scientific one.

Granted that the modern scientist's legitimate quest for objectivity necessitates careful exclusion of value judgments from his work. But that need only takes place in the experimental situation of a particular problem he is studying. But when the scientist is found to vehemently protest against value in any and all situations, he is really merely projecting his own personal and social philosophy. Such a philosophy may impress many as hollow and reflecting shallow concepts. That may or may not concern the scientist. For our present argument it is not important. However, it does become important if the scientist confuses his philosophical principles with scientific approach. In such case a most ironical thing takes place: In his extra-perfectionist attempts to exclude value judgments the scientist appears in a setting which is the direct antithesis of what he is supposed to strive for as a scientist, i.e., objectivity. His denial of all value is merely an expression of his own value scale. All too often are reflected in it antisocial attitudes bordering on the psychopathic. The fact that he does not give a hoot about this, that, or the other is hardly proof of his scientific mettle. Basically he is merely expressing a personal viewpoint—purely in the realm of the subjective, a value judgment which some idealist would label as "pigsty."

Such behavior on the part of scientists has been commonly noted. A typical example of it was recently witnessed by the present writer. An M. D. who for some years had been engaged in research in geriatrics was lecturing before a group of psychology professors and their very advanced graduate students. About 95 per cent of the group were of the general and experimental type in psychology. The lecturer was reporting on his research work on the aged. In the course of his talk the doctor went out of his way to emphasize and reëmphasize the fact that he was totally unconcerned with prolonging human life. He explained more than once that as a matter of fact the average span of human life had already been lengthened, and that the proportion of old people was too great. Providing for their support was already proving burdensome. Was the venerable scientist in his protestations being a greater scientist, or was he merely reflecting shallow social principles? One thing was certain. Most of his audience were as favorably impressed with these observations as the lecturer himself.

Subsequently, for a period of four months the present writer had occasion to observe the behavior of a bus driver as he revealed himself significantly in conversations with a fellow company official riding as a passenger. He was generally what would popularly be described as tough and hard-boiled. One morning, soon after starting on his usual trip, another vehicle was seen to knock down a man—a Negro. All the passengers in the bus seemed solicitously to inquire on how seriously the man had been injured. But the tough young bus driver with a remarkable kind of callous indifference laughingly commented on the accident and summarized the entire event as he watched the bleeding man being lifted into an ambulance with a "he'll live!"

The driver appeared to be a fairly intelligent man. From his conversations it was soon learned that he had never been to senior high school. Both he and the gerontologist of the above discussion were actually reflecting a personal value system. But the driver, unlike the doctor, was not confusing his personal viewpoint with what is science. Any suggestion that his obvious callousness was related to true scientific mettle would be totally foreign to him.

This confusion of concepts is often ludicrously apparent in the college professor with the would-be detached scientific mien. You find him frequently behaving as if cynical cutting manners and display of callousness were a parade of his objectivity. Yet rub his fur just a little in the wrong way and he will react with the primitivism of an Australian Bushman. He may still rationalize his savage attacks. But it is only a feeble attempt.

Thus the scientist who is over-sensitive in his exclusion of value judgments ends up by being catapulted into an antithetical position. This manifests itself in a general aggressiveness to any and all matters of what has been termed as positive value—positive value relating to the individual and the group. That such a position eventually becomes harmful to the scientist's scientific work may be inferred. But such a position may prove harmful not only to the scientist himself as a scientist, but to the social group of which he is a member.

Perhaps no one enjoys as high a prestige position in

the average twentieth century American community as the scientist. In an age grown conscious of super bombs, the scientist who is their creator has fully emerged from his supposedly ivory tower to the front page newspaper. To the popular mind he is as real as a Hollywood star. One might go on to trace his growing influence in all aspects of community life, and thus show that he has really become a force. Like all popular idols, he is imitated in some form or other by the average person. But what will the average American copy from the scientist? As far as his actual work is concerned, it will hardly go beyond a superficial interest in popular scientific mechanics. The real problems of the scientist will not prove of any significant inspiration to Tom Brown or Suzie Jones. Those are for the few intellectually inclined. But the average American can be quick to copy the scientist's value scale, for attitudes of callousness and shabby spiritual concepts can be easily adopted in the soil of an already materialistic and oversophisticated age. And it will certainly gather added weight as it basks in the reflected glory of a mistaken scientific halo.

The scientist's influence on public life is most concretely evident in America's greatest potent social organ—the school. True there are divergent viewpoints in education, and all is far from a dove-like state of peace. Idealists *à la* Hutchins, and realists, after the cut of Profesor H. D. Gideonse, are still wrangling with one another. But the basic philosophy upon which our school systems operate is a pragmatic one. As such it reflects the current scientific viewpoints of the age. Earlier in this paper the attempt was made to show that the value-shyness of the scientist is bound to have a reciprocal ill-effect on him as a scientist. Now, if the scientific approach is the one underlying our pragmatic educational philosophy, what happens to the scientist as a scientist is bound to be reflected in our schools. And since the school system is (as is generally accepted) synonymous with society, it follows that the scientist's confused handling of value judgments will influence the social group in which he operates.

A brief summary of the situation may then be made: The modern scientist runs clear of all value judgments because of his basic need for objectivity in his experimental research work. But in so doing he makes a confusion of denying all value concepts in general. This vehement protest is such that it projects his personal feelings and attitudes about a number of matters. Of course, such is philosophy, not science. The fact that he confuses the two proves to be the very antithesis of what a scientist tries to achieve. The harmful effects of such a condition will be felt by the scientist and the social group of which he is a part. Harmful effects may be expected on the scientist because of the confusion into which it leads him in his thinking, and ill effects on society may be expected because of the scientist's weighty influence in American communal life. An even greater ill-effect may occur to American society via the school system where the underlying pragmatic practices are in full consonance with the scientific approach.

It would certainly be much more honest, and a great deal healthier all around, if the scientist were to clarify to himself, once and for all, that an experimental setup, rigorously and operationally designed, is one thing, and an individual's own personal attitudes, values, concepts, ideals or lack of them is another. One relates to scientific approach and method; the other to a personal, social philosophy.

Silent Night, Holy Night?

BETHUEL GROSS

The Christmas season to most individuals represents a festive holiday anticipation, relaxation, and a period of social diversion. Christmas, to me, has and always will evoke a perplexed reaction of reflection and introspection. Try as I may, I cannot escape the interrogative dilemma that takes possession of my mind. The paradoxical inconsistencies of our celebration of Christmas creep over my emotional climate like a fog that stealthily moves in during the bleak hours of the dawn.

The story of the first Christmas is universally known. Jesus was born of humble, self-effacing parents in an uninhabitable stable. There were no elaborate preparations for His birth—no fanfares, no clamor, no celebrations. A few forlorn shepherds and several quiet-mannered scholars of an eastern kingdom unobtrusively paid their respects to Mary and Joseph. When Mary was able to travel, these three made their lonely way to Egypt, motivated by an apprehensiveness and fear of a hostile king. The shepherds returned to the hills, the eastern travelers returned to their homes, and life continued as usual in the Roman province of Judea.

The contrast of this unpretentious series of events to the present frantic frenzy of celebrating this incident has again made itself evident. The business sections of every hamlet, town, and city have been converted into hawking midways that resemble everything approaching an Oriental bazaar. Tinsel, baubles, colored lights, reindeer, and rotund, whiskered clowns are employed to assist the barkers to empty their loaded shelves. The cash registers jingle, the sales are computed as "good" or "bad," and the newspapers inform the customers of the number of shopping days left in which to participate in this commercial carnival.

Silent Night, Holy Night?

In every village square, on the wide streets of every residential district there stands a church. Many of our twentieth century citizens will make their annual visit to these churches to listen to the Christmas carols and to hear the minister or priest again remind his congregation that they are approaching the birthday of The Prince of Peace! This has been going on for some nineteen hundred years. The celebrants of this 1951 yuletide have experienced two world homicidal holocausts and it appears that we are making every preparation for a third cultural and moral suicide. Even though this Prince of Peace gave us the blueprints by which to establish the brotherhood of man, the guns are still roaring, the planes are still belching death and demolition, while the United Nations is desperately endeavoring to avoid a world-destructive, atomic free-for-all.

Silent Night, Holy Night?

The password of Christmas—in every language, on every continent—is "Merry Christmas." This is indeed an enigma, for the connotations of these two words

are diametrically opposed. Again—returning to the first Christmas—the story tells us that the shepherds and wise men kneeled in devotion to one who was later to become a carpenter, and would walk up and down the dusty roads of Galilee concerning Himself with the mental, emotional, and physical problems of all those with whom He came in contact. To say that He did not spend His life in serious indulgence is certainly an understatement. He was primarily concerned with all of the social conditions that produced frustration, heartache, and despair that had developed in His day. It is a little difficult for me to imagine that He celebrated His birthday by sending a basket of dates to the poor, buying His personal friends a vessel of figs, and inviting all His acquaintances to a party. He spent every day of each year questioning and attacking the multitudinous personal, social, and institutional philosophies of "Eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die."

The season to be merry is about to begin. The radios, the television sets, the theatres, the corner bars, the night clubs, and a merry round of office, club, and home parties will soon wear us down to a state of exhaustion and bloodshot eyes. Haul out the turkey, mix up a bowl of eggnog, strike up the band, let's make it a Merry Christmas!

Silent Night, Holy Night?

It is for these reasons that the Christmas season prompts me to place a question mark after the salutation, Silent Night, Holy Night! If we can make this Christmas season a period of turning the penetrating searchlight of self-analysis upon our mental tempers, then, and only then, can it perhaps enable us to understand the full implications of—

Silent Night, Holy Night!

If we can make this Christmas season a period of fumigating our sensuous dens of emotional pandemonium, then, and only then, can it perhaps enable us to appropriate all of the challenging ramifications and lofty significance of the eternal values inherent in—

Silent Night, Holy Night!!

Man's Changing Universe*

BRUNO LASKER

For many people religion is something connected with rituals presided over and guided by men whose professional function it is to act as brokers between men and God. It is a religion of which they are a little afraid, as one is afraid of mysterious influences on oneself which one cannot hope to understand. Especially in these days, when many people have come to doubt the validity of beliefs long held, when so many things happen to the individual and to society that tax the intelligence, there is a temptation to renounce rational thought. Some blindly accept the authority of dogmas that appeal to their feeling even though their thinking is no longer in tune with them. Others try to dismiss from their minds the concern which through the ages has been central in the striving of men: their concern with the mysterious forces that are the major sources of their fortunes and misfortunes and about which they can do nothing of an immediate and practical nature.

Man has always been aware of his comparative insignificance in the order of things even when he placed himself in the center of it and proudly imagined the sun and the moon and the stars to revolve about his person. It gave him a sense of security to feel, though he was small and weak, that some greater power or combination of powers was watching over him.

The fears of primitive man were somewhat allayed as he realized that not all the movement he saw around him—the growth of vegetation, the current of the streams, the migration of wild herds, the flight of birds—was impelled by the arbitrary will of so many independent spirits, but that all natural occurrences were somehow ruled by compulsions they could not escape. He watched the movements of the heavenly bodies and saw that they, too, followed a regular orbit; and he noticed the relation between that orbit and the seasons. By remembering the coincidences in nature he learned to predict tides and temperatures. His anxiety to appease each menacing force—wind and water, bush and beast, earth-tremor and torrent—gave way to an urge to explore the reason for, or at least the occasion of, its occurrence. But the ultimate cause remained shrouded in mystery; and so he built altars to unknown gods. These he could imagine only in animal or quasi-human forms, as organisms animated by desires similar to his own. When the earth was convulsed or the sea lashed against the shore, when a mighty tree fell under the fury of a storm, when a spring dried up and the fruit of the earth died unripened, he sought to ward off the wrath of the gods, and so prayer and sacrifice were born.

At such times the leader who possessed the magical instrument of invocation—often inherited from father to son—and knowledge of the secret formulas found the commoners willing to obey his instructions. And since the leader, either an old man or a member of a privileged caste, usually commanded lores and skills of actual benefit to the many, others did not often scrutinize his words and acts in the light of their own experiences. In times of trouble, especially, men tend to lean on the bearers of tradition even though, objectively regarded, the effectiveness of their incantations and commands might be open to question. At least, as we say when we carry charms or rap on wood, it can do no harm to observe practices in which our ancestors so strongly believed.

One day I went to see the sights of Nagasaki in the company of a Japanese student. Among other places we visited a hillside temple where people in a holiday mood celebrated the blossoming of the cherry trees in which the temple yard abounded. I noticed that the student bought a number of prayer papers at the gate and fastened them to the twigs of different trees. "What are you doing that for?" I asked him. "I don't know," he answered. "My father always used to do this." "And why did your father?" He hesitated for a moment, then said with a big smile, "I never asked him; I suppose he did because my grandfather did so before him."

We, too, have our sacred cherry trees, but we no longer expect the spirits that dwell in them to perform miracles on our behalf. Recent knowledge of our

---

*Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Unitarian Society of Fort Wayne, Indiana, October 12, 1951.

physical universe is playing havoc with our cherished myths. It has brought with it new religious and moral problems, and Unitarians among others try to come to grips with them. But some of us are, I am afraid, so preoccupied with current issues, whether personal or social, that we do not take time enough for historical retrospection. That is a pity; for as we follow the evolution of religious faith and of morality, we are reassured that the problems we face today are not unique. There have been many periods of transition during which it was difficult for people to adjust their minds to new knowledge. Worship still is for most, as it was throughout history, largely appeasement of the unknown. But other elements in it have gradually grown. The prayers of men still beseech the unseen spirits for help; but increasingly they are tradition-sanctioned forms of words by which they seek to ascertain the will of the heavenly powers, so that they may bend their own conduct to the cosmic design.

It is true, there are some who look upon chance as the only law. As in ancient times priests manipulated oracle bones or the intestines of slaughtered pigs to find guidance through the labyrinth of choices, so now the worshippers of chance manipulate their dice and the listings of the stock exchange. Statistical charts are their bibles. Zeus' thunderbolt, unpredictable and yet predicted, has nothing on the random-shot of nature with which the new necromancer explains the unexplainable. As a child in a bad dream calls for his mother, so the gambler in his extremity calls upon his saints, but his dream is short.

The genuinely religious man asks for guidance in his own conduct. He does not try to deflect natural law from his own head but to learn what it is. Cultural history is the record of that search. Once the human mind was aroused to a quest for the sources of power, once man had come to realize that his fortunes are influenced by sequences of cause and effect that are largely ascertainable, he attempted to bring his conduct into harmony with a design which he divined though he could not understand it, a design only incidentally related to his own fortunes. He still placed himself in the center of reality, wishing to profit from whatever knowledge he could gain of the cosmos. But with each advance in his understanding the horizon moved farther away, until modern science made it infinitely remote.

We are sometimes told that science is the enemy of religion, and that religion is the enemy of science. Both statements rest on a false concept of both science and religion. Religion is not the wild scramble of the gambler for some mysterious force that can be geared to human desires. It is, and always has been, search for a fuller realization of the meaning of life and of man's place in the universe. As they learned of the laws of nature and saw them reflected in their own fortunes and in the requirements of successful social systems, men's quest for guidance more and more took on the character of rational inquiry. And the quest became a moralizing force.

It has been a long and slow journey of the mind from preoccupation with immediate exigencies to preoccupation with the continuous harmonization of human acts with the evolving cosmic pattern. That journey has taught us foresight and humility. It has not reached its end but, on the contrary, has reached the stage where we can see how near we yet are to the beginning. It has occupied less than ten thousand of the half a million years of man's attested history, possibly much less. For, we may say that it began when thinkers and lawgivers first held up an ideal of human conduct in which rights won by force are subordinated to, even cancelled out by, rights derived from man's creative coöperation with other forces. It began when the old blend of materialism and fear gave way to men's desire for goodness and truth and beauty.

Religion and philosophy preceded science as we think of it today; but they were so much a part of the everyday life of men that it did not occur to them to separate in their thinking a realm of material tasks from a realm of "spiritual" obligations. The simple peasant even today performs his little religious rites between his chores. To treat religion as something altogether apart from everyday life is a relatively recent and, even from a scientific psychological standpoint, untenable mental operation. It expresses a pride in material achievement which shamefacedly relegates religion to a special time and a special place; and there is no justification for that pride.

Under the influence of this dualism, moral law often is interpreted today as though it were exclusively a matter of applying behavior to the requirements of social living under different sets of circumstances. It is less easy to see that it is also an expression of man's striving for concord with those strains of the cosmic symphony that lie outside the framework of his own immediate welfare.

The development of moral conscience, it is true, to some extent followed the growing intricacy and widening scheme of human relations, as family and clan came to be integrated in tribes, in communities, in nations, and—most recently—in an as yet dim but recognizable international society. It followed the interpenetration of groups with different antecedents, habits, and beliefs. But it also kept step with the enlargement of general knowledge. As men reflected upon the forces that affect human life, as they learned to predict the natural occurrences through which these forces impinged upon their destinies, they saw the necessity of making human conduct more predictable, too. And they began to do so by restraining passions and arbitrary exercise of power, by bringing order into human affairs and modeling human relations on those symbiotic patterns by which nature meets the needs of diverse forms of life which depend for their sustenance on the same soil.

Thus, the great lawgivers of the ancient world usually also were religious leaders. They did not merely codify the practices that had proved conducive to social peace and prosperity but also tried, as far as they could, to integrate human conduct with the universal system of controls that bind man to his natural environment. There is much evidence of this in the myths and ceremonials of primitive societies and of the ancient world: the Chinese emperor's symbolic plowing of a field each year but also his sacrifices at the Altar of Heaven, for example. It permeates the church life of the European Middle Ages with its festivals and mystery plays. It is exemplified in Bergson's *Creative Evolution* and in George Bernard Shaw's *Saint Joan of Arc,* now happily restored to the American stage. There are traces of it in recent works of Bertrand Russell who, earlier in his life, tried to build an unsurmountable wall between the concerns of philosophy and of ethics.

You must forgive me if I seem to soar through the centuries with the speed of a superman. What I wish to emphasize is that understanding and not ignorance,

penetrating inquiry and not indifference, have produced the moral basis of society, from the dawn of history to our time. If it is contended that in the modern age science has led to the growth of materialism and moral decay, the implication is that somehow the old sequence between deeper insight and refined conscience has been broken; that science itself has taken a turn away from the old concern with essentials to a mere curiosity about things unrelated to the fundamental quest of the human spirit.

This is something different from the complaint made in every age—usually by persons without imagination and with a vested interest in things as they are—that new knowledge is corrupting youth. When such knowledge does not fit in with the traditions and tends to harm the prestige of the guardians of the traditions, the charge is easily explained on subjective grounds. But the charge that modern science gives rise to materialism is particularly untrue and harmful. No other profession displays ethical standards and their application to personal conduct more fully than does the modern man of science. He is almost by definition devoted to the pursuit of the good life; and no matter what social theories he may on occasion expound, his pursuit of the good life is almost unthinkable without the motivation of an exalted view of human destiny.

If there has been demoralization as a result of scientific progress, we must look for the cause in circles engaged in the application of its findings to material ends. Not all of them, by any means. The inventors and technicians who make scientific knowledge productive are, for the most part, close to the scientist's pursuit and share his attributes. Though a few of them die rich, most of them place the satisfactions of creative work before material gain. But in all ages there have been parasitic groups that fasten themselves on the creative elements in the community. Some of them exploit the ignorance and superstition of the simple-minded. Others prefer to exploit new knowledge for their own enrichment, to feather their nests with plumage found in the poultry-yard of science. It is they who try to justify their abandonment of the traditional restraints in human relations with reference to the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest. It is they who prate about sturdy individualism, so as to lower the safeguards of the social interest against their depredations. Today some of these parasites gush about democracy while they try to force all our energies into military channels from which they, and they alone, stand to benefit. It is they who would limit our freedom of speech and intimidate men with unconventional ideas. They are the real materialists of our time, the real seducers of youth.

Because these excrescences of commercialism have already destroyed a large part of the moral foundation of our society, we who cherish other than material values must take counsel together and take common action to preserve them. It is this which seems to me to be one of the main tasks of your society.

Probably we do not altogether agree, as individuals, on what constitutes the good life—whether in terms of enjoyment or of conduct; but we need not helplessly look on as our cultural heritage is dissipated, even wilfully destroyed. What we see of beauty and goodness in modern society grows from the same imperishable root of man's faith in the meaningfulness of his life that has animated our forebears for ages past. New knowledge is not a life-destroying gale, at least it need not be; I prefer to think of it as a gentle rain which, generation after generation, nourishes new shoots of understanding from the same old root.

This Unitarian Society is a nursery of those healthy impulses. Its aim is to bring them to flower and fruition. Not only our discussions and our listening to those who can deepen our insight but also our common worship, strengthening the bond between us, are essential to the fulfilment of our lives. Such a fellowship as this enhances personal power and can give all who are part of it a sense of self-realization. Only thus can the common aim be advanced.

The public debates in the community, the nation, and the world at large may easily mislead some about the paramount issue of our time. It is not a clearcut choice between individualism and socialism or between tradition and progress. Rather, it is a conflict between good and evil. Self-interest will long continue as an important motive force, is not in itself evil. What we have to combat is the tendency of both individuals and of social groups to force their special interests on others. The lessening of geographical and social distances has greatly increased both the area and the degree of individual and social interaction; there is no means of providing for the preservation and further growth of civilization except through concerted planning. There is need for a larger integration of human desires, for more choices of behavior that tend to strengthen social ties. But there is need also for stronger, more mature, more highly sensitized personalities. There is need for entire honesty with ourselves; and this also can be nurtured in the intimate comradeship of such a society as this. Here we are free to say what we like, to change our minds if we like, to grow with the larger perception of our own purpose in life, our place in the total scheme of things, for which the activities of this society afford so many opportunities.

Moral rejuvenation cannot take place in a social vacuum. It is conditioned by far-reaching social changes; and so it is natural that this society should give much of its time and thought to causes not intimately connected with the immediate responsibilities of its members. Hard thinking is of the essence of accomplishment. By your example you can lead others into this perhaps not too familiar form of activity. For instance, the program of your Women's Alliance should stimulate the thinking of many women in the community who are not yet members. More confident in your own powers as harbingers of a new Age of Enlightenment, many of you should be able to induce others to reëxamine their experience and their views—not in the light of a new dogma, but with a new earnestness in the pursuit of the good and the true.

Way to Progress

You and I stand at the apex of centuries of struggling with the great problems of mankind. Behind us are the great minds who offer us the service of their experience and thought. Indeed, we should be greater philosophers than any of the past, since we have all the past to help us. Let us, then, consider what those of the past tell us. Let us ponder their advice carefully. And let us carry on from where they have had to stop. This is the way to progress and to a more perfect philosophy.

—*S. E. Frost, Jr.*

Two Eminent Individualist-Humanists: Gide and Santayana

VICTOR S. YARROS

Our age is irreverent and distinctly skeptical. It is loath to bestow the order of merit on men or women of exceptional gifts and accomplishments. But there is no denying the uniqueness of Gide and Santayana in the realm of letters and thought. Neither founded a school, and neither had ambition or interest in popularity. Both were supremely independent, detached, far above the battles here below. Gide was not an original thinker in the last analysis. He was a man of letters rather than a philosopher, whereas Santayana is un-American in his philosophy, incurably Latin, and a poet rather than a logician. Both were stylists, and each created his style the better to express his unconventional ideas. Neither was ever quite satisfied with his formulations; each was full of nuances and shades of meaning beyond the comprehension of the average reader of difficult works.

I shall not pin any label on either of them. But we can consider the views they struggled with and managed to set down in advanced age for our edification.

In the first place, they were inveterate individualists, despite the collectivist trends and tides of the time. Technology did not particularly interest them. Gadgets meant nothing to them. Simple living and high thinking were their natural elements. Modern inventions left them indifferent. They had no love for mankind and professed none, though both were essentially Humanists.

Santayana has repeatedly declared himself a materialist and a naturalist. This position, he insists, is not irreligious. The naturalist can be a poet, a musician, a lover of beauty and goodness. "Religion in essence is the recognition of the Powers on which our destiny truly depends and the art of propitiating those Powers and of living in devout harmony with them." The materialist is no foe of spirit, but of false claims in behalf of the spirit. He respects and is friendly to popular religion in so far as it exalts or serves spirit and makes for harmony.

Santayana is not a Christian and not a monotheist, if his words have any meaning. He speaks of Powers, not of *a* Power. He rejects what is called Revelation. If he perplexes the orthodox, he is sorry, but the style is the man, and he is, after all, a poet even in his prose. He is too subtle to be lucid, and he writes, like Stendhal, for the "happy few."

However, even the few are often perplexed by his expressions. Thus, in speaking of death he says that "it is easy, almost pleasant, to give up the world if we know what the world is, and we never die too soon if we have found something eternal to live with." This is a most enigmatic utterance. Is anything eternal? Is mankind eternal? Is the cosmos itself eternal? If we die young, we have not "lived" with anything eternal long enough to enjoy the bliss; and being human, we cannot fail to regret the fact, unless we believe in a hereafter. Surely Santayana does not believe in the crude, naive, orthodox hereafter. It is clear that he has a nostalgic, sentimental attachment to Roman Catholicism. Reason hardly justifies that attachment, but we human beings are not always rational. Santayana is aware of that, but he is not a scientist nor a rigorous logician. Protestantism he calls " a tradesman's religion," and the ultimate Protestant ideal, he says, "is to have no outward or specific religion at all—no priests, churches, theology, scripture or Sabbath, indeed no God." This is gratuitous and arbitrary. Nothing in history warrants this inference. Nothing in logic justifies it. Catholics, too, have been known to reject supernaturalism and embrace agnosticism, but not because of any peculiarity in their faith. Secularism and Humanism are steadily gaining ground at the expense of *all* orthodoxies and all supernaturalism. This is an irreversible trend, and all the sciences, physical and social, are contributing to it.

Santayana is no admirer of democracy, yet he is no aristocrat in principle. He sees little sense in counting heads, but even less sense in breaking them. What is the alternative—philosopher kings and presidents? Hardly! Santayana has been called a rational anarchist, but this is not really a fit label for him. He certainly is no State-ist, no collectivist, but neither does he favor class rule. Concrete issues, whether economic or political, seem not to interest him. He dwells, to repeat, in the realm of abstractions and generalizations. He has never taken part in reform movements. He is no fighter. Programs are not his forte. He is satisfied that war is not caused by human pugnacity and aggressiveness, and a ruthless world dictator, he opines, could do away with wars of strictly economic origin and nature. The other causes of war—and there *are* such—are apparently unpreventable as yet. The future may or may not solve that problem.

André Gide, for years the acknowledged leader of the French literary world, was less complex and less

---

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 70)

who thinks that something may be done about peace, are any threat to the security of this government."

ACLU has not been the only group to protest. The gag rule has also brought strong protests from one major paper, the Cleveland Press; the Ohio Congress of Industrial Organizations; Bishop Michael Ready, Columbus Roman Catholic Diocese, and Bishop Hagen R. Werner of the Ohio Methodist Church; student and faculty groups; and others.

An offer by the Cleveland ACLU unit to arrange a forum for public discussion of the issue has not been accepted by the trustees.

So far Bevis has barred one speaker from the campus under the ruling—Dr. Cecil Hinshaw, a Quaker pacifist and former president of William Penn College in Iowa. Prior to Bevis' relaxing of the gag rule, it had been feared that a scheduled "Religion and Life Week" at OSU would be jeopardized by the gag rule. It had also been reported that the American Physical Society had threatened to move its annual meeting elsewhere because of the gag rule.

ACLU Bulletin.

baffling than Santayana. He, too, was first and last an individualist and Humanist. His record is less consistent than that of Santayana. Born into a strict austere Protestant and Calvinist family, he never quite freed himself from the influences of his childhood. His religious opinions underwent evolution, and at one period he was undoubtedly a theist, perhaps a Spinozist. His Catholic friends hoped at one time to convert him to their religious philosophy, but he was too critical and conscientious to commit himself to any very definite system. "Revelation," he wrote in his *Journals* shortly before his death, "what have I to do with it?" To a logical and rigorous thinker this was a strange question. What have we to do with Revelation? Why, everything. If Revelation was a fact, it was a world-shaking fact. It revolutionized human life. If it was a fiction, as rationalists hold, the recognition of *that* fact is equally revolutionary and world-shaking. If man must solve his own problems, without any aid from "divine" sources or powers—as the rationalists affirm—then supernaturalism in religion is worse than meaningless. If, as some theologians maintain, sinful man can *never* save himself and only divine grace and love can—and will—redeem him and eliminate evil from his future everlasting and abundant life in another world, then secularism and Humanism are the most dangerous delusions and snares, and our works on science and philosophy are heaps of rubbish.

Gide died an atheist, though he had used the term God in some obscure sense. He wrote in his *Journals* that God was still evolving and "becoming," and that we humans are his real creators. All gods are man-made, man-imagined, according to the rationalists. This is intelligible prose, not poetry or metaphor.

Gide was a mixture of classicism, romanticism, and impressionism. He was not a first-rate novelist, but a sincere and truth-seeking artist, given to introspection and conscious of his eccentricities—homosexuality, for example, a vice he was not ashamed of even in advanced age. He was always honest with himself. He was no superpatriot, and never pretended to be one. He admired German genius and said so. He was charged with cowardice, opportunism, and vacillation, and all he said was that he could see the other side of the questions which caused tension and discord between nations, races, and classes, and just had to be true to his own nature. Hypocrisy, dogmatism, and bigotry were utterly repugnant to him.

Socialism and Communism appealed to him as champions of social justice and equality, and he sympathized with the oppressed and exploited without ever doing much for them. Politics and economics he never studied scientifically. His half-formulated ideas in these spheres were superficial and lightly held. The spirit mattered more to Gide than any concrete program. He fervently welcomed the Bolshevik revolution, but a little experience in Russia, as a guest of the Kremlin and the "controlled" press, disillusioned and sobered him, and he repudiated the whole Soviet-Communist system. He was an anarchist in his attitude toward organized government, like Santayana. He owed his high position to his style, his versatility, his charity, and his freedom from fanaticism. On the whole, he was an attractive asset to Humanism and rationalism.

Correspondence

A Reply to Mr. Turner

To UNITY:

I was interested to read Glenn P. Turner's criticism, in the July-August issue, of Kenneth L. Patton's article on "Literary Values in Worship" in the May-June issue of UNITY. As a World Federalist and believer in Esperanto as a world language, Mr. Turner thinks Mr. Patton should have had better uses of his time, with the world getting ready for a third World War, than to write such an artice. Now I have the impression, after reading Mr. Patton's article, that since it is written frequently in words of more than one or two syllables Mr. Turner did not get his point. I understand the point of Mr. Patton's article is for the average ministers to cease being wordmongers and purveyors of worship clichés, so that they can talk about important things in church and on Sunday. Mr. Patton mentioned several subjects they should preach about, including "issues of war and peace" and "the idolatry of nationalism." This should have satisfied Mr. Turner. Perhaps Mr. Patton is not a World Federalist or a believer in Esperanto, but if he is I am sure he discusses them in his church. Personally, I am a World Federalist and a believer in a world language, but I do not think that any artificial language is as satisfactory as a living language of international scope. I therefore advocate Basic English as a world language, which can be developed into the full English language as the individual progresses in his studies.

Mr. Turner says: "To characterize the author of the Jefferson Bible as a heretic is just as bad as to say of Lincoln that he was an unbeliever." What does he mean by "bad"? I guess "bad" from his own orthodox point of view! Would Mr. Turner call Thomas Paine's religious views "bad"? Both Paine and Jefferson were called atheists in their day, but were deists and friends. Only Jefferson was the more radical of the two, even questioning the existence of a God and calling himself a Materialist! He was certainly a heretic from the orthodox Christian point of view. Lincoln, although not as radical an unbeliever as Jefferson, was an admirer of both Paine and Jefferson. Among the innumerable Christian denominations in the United States to choose from, he never joined a church—not even the Unitarian. Although deists, like Paine and Jefferson, may use the term "God" in their writings, they do not mean the Christian God but the totally different deistic God. Yet the mere mention of "God" did not come easy to Lincoln, even in the most important of his writings. For example, there is not one reference to deity in his carefully prepared Cooper Institute Address, nor in the original drafts of the Emancipation Proclamation and the Gettysburg Address. The people who knew Lincoln best have also testified that he disbelieved the Christian system. All this does not mean to say, however, that Paine, Jefferson, and Lincoln did not cherish the great human "values," for not being sidetracked into the dead-end street of Christianity they were free to develop the real values of this world.

Yours for World Government, Basic English, and accuracy.

SHERMAN D. WAKEFIELD.

New York City.

The Study Table

A Remarkable Frenchman

RABELAIS. *By John Cowper Powys. New York: Philosophical Library. 424 pp. $3.75.*

This is an admirable attempt on the part of a scholar of unique ability to give moderns a fresh chance for becoming better acquainted with the great satirist, poker-of-fun, and humanist, Rabelais. Devotees of common sense were rare in Rabelais' murky age, which is what makes this remarkable Frenchman all the more remarkable. Mr. Powys has established for himself an enviable reputation for bright and fascinating scholarship, and this volume is no exception. It musters all the available facts about Rabelais' life and arranges them in a fashion which, as far as this reviewer knows, represents the most complete and exciting Rabelais biography in the English language. Of special interest to many will be the new, perceptive translations of many of the choicest passages from Rabelais' works. What Mr. Powys has selected for fresh translation represent to him the highest examples of Rabelais' genius. They certainly remind us again of the sharpness of Rabelais' wit and constructive irreverence when he goes to work on the stiff-necked follies of pedantry and religious intolerance.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Antidote

VERSUS: REFLECTIONS OF A SOCIOLOGIST. *By Henry Pratt Fairchild. New York: The Philosophical Library.* 196 *pp.* $3.75.

This book is a compilation of essays by this outstanding sociologist over the period 1915-1937. Some of the titles of the essays are "Profit Versus Prosperity," "Liberty Versus Security," "Popularity Versus Pedagogy," "Machine Versus Men," "Labor Versus Leisure," "Hunger Versus Love." Each essay, of course, marks the author's thinking as of the period of its completion and may not be in total agreement with points of view as of 1951. However, the author offers some very incisive comments regarding these areas. In the essay, "Liberty Versus Security," for instance, the author speaks quite directly to social controls and institutional behavior. He points out that law as the final social control is not really an attempt to change behavior but to make living more efficient. Some of the recent work around sociological implications of FEPC in other legislations might not concur with this because it is felt that the law does exert a rather particular pressure upon the population which might not otherwise have been felt. The entire book is an antidote against single causation and is very helpful in rounding out exaggerated ideas of one-sided hypotheses.

CHANNING M. BRIGGS.

Common Elements

THIS IS THE WAY: PRAYERS AND PRECEPTS FROM WORLD RELIGIONS. *Chosen by Jessie Orton Jones. New York: The Viking Press. 62 pp. $3.00.*

Those readers who are familiar with Mrs. Jones' previous volume, *Small Rain,* (and many newcomers, too), will be happy to learn of this present volume which is a judicious collection of prayers and sayings from the great religions of the world. There is no moralizing, but the selections are made with such care from the lore of the American Indian, the Oriental religions, and Christianity, that one easily traces some of the common elements of all in the search for a fuller life. The texts are charmingly amplified by the double-page drawings in yellow and gray by Mrs. Jones' daughter, Elizabeth Orton Jones, in which we watch an Indian child travel over new roads, gathering joyous companions from these other cultures. A delightful book to give or to own and a splendid addition to worship material for teachers and religious educators of children aged six to ten.

DOROTHY HOPKINS SCHAAD.

Consumption

THE PRODIGAL CENTURY. *By Henry Pratt Fairchild. New York: The Philosophical Library.* 251 *pp.* $3.75.

This book emphasizes the tremendous exploitation and waste of the nineteenth century in the United States. The author shows how the country has wasted and depleted innumerable resources in advancing toward the Pacific Coast. One startling comment appears on page 100 where the author points out that the natural productive capacity of the land has been deteriorating at a rate almost fast enough to offset all the improvements in soil and crop management.

Again, it is pointed out that Veblen's conspicuous consumption seems to be as prevalent today as it was in the 1800s. The glorification of scarcity and the tremendous loss of productive energies in advertising, graft, and similar social cancers are well-illustrated. The author's satire reaches a high point when he quotes a French artist as saying that the most American example he could think of was the cereal, puffed rice, which is puffed eight times its natural size. This fine book is not a condemnation necessarily of the swashbuckling days of the American frontier, but it does offer many facts which should be taken into consideration in looking forward to the next half or the next full century.

CHANNING M. BRIGGS.

A Broad Discussion

SPOKESMEN FOR ETHICAL RELIGION. *By Henry Neumann. Boston: Beacon Press. 175 pp. $2.00.*

Consisting of biographical sketches of the great figures in the history of the Ethical Culture Society, this book becomes a companion piece of David Saville Muzzey's *Ethics As a Religion* in celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the organizing of the first Ethical Culture Society in America in 1876 by Felix Adler.

Felix Adler, as educator, reformer, and teacher of religion, gets top billing, followed by John Lovejoy Elliott and a collection of other American and European spokesmen for Ethical Religion.

Fortunately this book is more than a mere memorial volume. It has great intrinsic interest not only for those who would like to know more about the Ethical Movement as such, but also for all those who have a stake in the growing sway of liberal thought in religion. Part II of Mr. Neumann's book devotes itself to a discussion of broad questions of religious thought and action which are certainly as germane to Unitarians, Universalists, and other religious liberals as to Ethical Culturists.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

MINNEAPOLIS DEDICATION

November 11-18 marked the dedication festivities of the new church building of the Minneapolis Unitarian Society. This modern, $350,000 building is purely functional and stands as a perfect symbol of the practical religion taught and exemplified by the Minneapolis Society. At the opening service on November 11, Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President of the Western Unitarian Conference, gave the sermon. The sermon at the closing service on November 18 was given by Dr. E. Burdette Backus, minister of All Souls Unitarian Church of Indianapolis, Indiana. The Service of Dedication was held Wednesday evening, November 14. Dr. Raymond B. Bragg, former minister of the Minneapolis Society and now Executive Director of the Unitarian Service Committee, gave the dedication address. Greetings were brought by Randall S. Hilton for the Western Unitarian Conference, by Walter Chapin for the Minnesota Unitarian Conference, by Rev. Carl Olson for the Universalists, by Arthur Foote for the St. Paul Unitarian Church, and by Mayor Hoyer, a member of the Society, for the City of Minneapolis. The architect, Mr. Roy Thorshov, a member of the Society, presented the philosophy underlying the structure. The chairman of the building committee, Mr. Earl Ewald, presented the building to Mr. Frank Stone, Chairman of the Board, and Rev. Carl A. Storm, Minister.

MINNESOTA CONFERENCE

As a part of Dedication Week at Minneapolis, the Minnesota Unitarian Conference held its 1951 meeting on November 17. A youth meeting was held in conjunction with it. Both the young people and the adults used the group method, including buzz sessions, in dealing with various subjects. There was a good attendance despite the inclement weather. A blizzard and icy roads prevented the Hanska delegation from getting to Minneapolis. It was announced at the Conference that Angora, Minnesota, was the first church in the Western Conference to pay its full share of the United Unitarian Appeal.

MEMORIAL

A picture portrait of the late Mrs. Milma Sophia Lappala Erkkila was unveiled by the Angora, Minnesota, Society as a part of a memorial service for her on November 11. She was minister of this church from its founding in 1916 until her death last year. The work is being carried on by her husband, Mr. Matt Erkkila.

NAGY INSTALLED

Rev. Zoltan Nagy was installed as minister at Alton, Illinois, on October 7. Rev. Raymond B. Bragg, Director of the Unitarian Service Committee and the person primarily responsible for bringing Mr. Nagy to the United States, gave the installation sermon. Dr. Thaddeus Clark, St. Louis, and Randall Hilton, Chicago, also participated in the service.

IOWA UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION

The Iowa Unitarian Association (the Iowa-Nebraska Conference) held its seventy-fourth annual meeting at Omaha, October 26-28, 1951. On the opening night Rev. R. Lester Mondale, minister of the Unitarian Church of Kansas City, Missouri, gave the Judy Lecture. The meetings were brought to a close Sunday morning at the Conference Service with Rev. Philip Schug, Lincoln, Nebraska, giving the sermon. The Saturday noon luncheon was addressed by Randall S. Hilton, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, on the subject "A Time for Unitarians." The banquet Saturday evening was featured by talks from leaders of the Fellowships in the Conference and brief comments by the new minister at Iowa City. A Sunday morning discussion and a Saturday panel discussion on church membership rounded out the program which was both practical and inspirational.

At the business session it was announced that Miss Frances Wood, field worker for the Department of Education of the American Unitarian Association, would spend the month of November visiting the church schools of the Conference. Funds for this were provided by the Association. Mr. Spencer Day, Sioux City, was elected President, and John W. Brigham, minister of the Sioux City Unitarian Church, was reëlected Secretary.

MICHIGAN AREA CONFERENCE

The Michigan Area Unitarian Conference met at Ann Arbor, November 2-3, 1951. The meetings were featured by the use of group methods and procedures in dealing with the various aspects of churchmanship. Business was kept at a minimum with only certain recommendations being made to a meeting to be called in late January or February. The delegates were addressed by Rev. Arthur Olsen. Rev. Raymond B. Johnson, Director of the Department of the Ministry of the American Unitarian Association, was a guest and met with the ministers. The Secretary of the Western Conference also participated.

On the Monday preceding these meetings the Michigan Conference held a Religious Education Seminar in Detroit under the leadership of Miss Frances Wood.

THE PRAIRIE GROUP

Some twenty-two ministers from the Western and Southwestern Unitarian Conferences met at Pere Marquette State Park, Grafton, Illinois, November 5-7, 1951. This group, dedicated to serious study, devoted two full days to the discussion of the significance and application of Myth and Symbols. They were aided in maintaining their confined concentration by the season's first snowstorm which piled up twelve inches of snow at the park.

Arthur Foote was elected Chairman and Thaddeus Clark, Scribe. Aron Gilmartin and John Hayward were elected as the program committee. At the next meeting the subject will be in the field of Communications and Group Methods.

U.M.A. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Following the sessions of the Prairie Group, the Executive Committee of the Unitarian Ministers Association met at Pere Marquette Lodge. Raymond B. Johnson, Director of the Department of the Ministry, and Randall S. Hilton, Regional Director, American Unitarian Association, met with the committee for discussion and consultation on the problems and procedures in filling vacant pulpits and settling ministers.

A LETTER OF NOTE

In the last issue of UNITY there was a brief note in the Western Conference News about Arthur Olsen returning from Europe. A member of the Toledo Board has written a letter telling what this trip meant to the church.

"Dear Mr. Hilton:

After a series of sermons on World Conditions, some members of the First Unitarian Church of Toledo expressed a wish that Mr. Olsen could travel in Europe. The opportunity to join the Sherwood Eddy Seminar was the inspiration for the church to send him. The Board of Trustees and the various organizations worked together in raising fifteen hundred dollars. The Supper Club gave a Bon Voyage Dinner in June and realized their pledge of two hundred dollars. The Woman's Alliance gave the Welcome Home Dinner and more than earned their two hundred and fifty dollar pledge. The other organizations contributing were the Evening Alliance, Senior Fellowship, and the Channing Club. These organizations earned half of the expenses and the balance was incorporated in the church budget.

How has the church benefitted? Such benefits are rather intangible, but four hundred and forty-nine persons were in church on the opening Sunday in September, and the weekly attendance since then has been much above that of a year ago. Also, over three hundred people attended the Welcome Home dinner, and the enthusiastic reception given to the two-hour talk proved that the members felt they had a personal share in his experiences rather than a mere financial interest. One reason that this trip was a success was the fact that it was not just a travel tour, but rather a study tour with opportunity to meet government and labor leaders which would not be possible for most tourists. The group not only heard these leaders speak but were allowed to ask questions and have discussions with them. Time for sightseeing and other activities was also provided.

Another reason that Mr. Olsen's trip was so interesting to the Toledo Community is that the people felt they shared in aiding him to visit Norway, his family's birthplace, where he was able to locate some of his non-English speaking relatives.

The publicity value of the trip as far as the church is concerned cannot be accurately measured, nor can the pleasure that people have had in looking at the beautiful Kodachrome slides of Switzerland and other countries, which he took on this trip, be determined. They have been more than satisfactory.

We of the Toledo church are delighted to have had this opportunity to broaden our minister's and our own horizons. This has been done through his sermons and public lectures and particularly through personal talks with him. We are now looking for other travel opportunities where we can send Mr. Olsen to study the economic and social conditions that are of international concern, and so to help us all to a better understanding of world problems.

Why can't the Unitarians establish a national seminar study fund to be offered to their ministers?

Sincerely,

Catharine C. Myers."

THE NEW OLSEN

Arthur Olsen, minister of the Toledo Unitarian Church, in speaking before the Michigan Area Conference, of his trip to Europe, implied that this was the Unitarian version of "being born again," that he had returned a "new man," refreshed in body, mind and spirit. The significance and value of this to him and to the church was underscored. He commented to the effect that he could not understand why more churches did not avail themselves of the opportunity to thus improve the breadth and interest of its leadership.

CARPE DIEM!

The triennial conference of the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom will be held at Oxford, England, next summer. A worthwhile Christmas present to the church would be assuring your minister he could attend.

HENRIKSEN INSTALLED

Alfred J. N. Henriksen was installed as minister of the Unitarian church in Iowa City, Iowa, on November 5. Dr. Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, gave the installation sermon. Rev. Waldemar Argow, Cedar Rapids, gave the installation prayer, and Randall Hilton, the charges to the minister and congregation. Dean Allan Dakin, chairman of the board of trustees, conducted the act of installation. The various welcomes to the Henriksens were presented at a dinner which preceded the service.

UNITARIAN SERVICE COMMITTEE

Minneapolis, November 15.—Dr. Raymond Bragg, Dr. Leo Rigler, and Dr. H. L. Lippman addressed a meeting of the Minnesota Chapter of the Unitarian Service Committee. Dr. Rigler, Radiologist, was on the Missions to Israel and Iran. Dr. Lippman, Psychiatrist, was on the Educational Mission to Germany. Mr. James Gray, noted reviewer for the *Saturday Review of Literature* and Historian of the University of Minnestota, is President of the Minnesota Chapter.

Cincinnati, November 18.—The Director of the Unitarian Service Committee, Dr. Bragg, addressed the Unitarians of the First Church here as a part of the drive to raise funds for the Committee.

Chicago, November 19.—Two hundred people attended a banquet at the LaSalle Hotel sponsored by the Chicago Area Unitarian Service Committee. Dr. Alonzo Grace, Director of Advance Studies at New York University, and Dr. Paul Dudley White, noted heart specialist of Boston, were the principal speakers. Mr. Lawrence Channing, Boston National Campaign Chairman, and Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Chairman of the Chicago Chapter, also spoke. Dr. John Reynolds, Chicago Campaign Chairman, presided. Instrumental music was provided by Mr. and Mrs. Rafael Kubelik. Mr. Kubelik is the Conductor of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra.

HAVE YOU READ?

World Religions and the Hope for Peace, by David Rhys Williams

The Wit and Wisdom of Gandhi, by Homer A. Jack

Freedom Is the Right to Choose, by Archibald MacLeish

Order through the Western Conference Book Department.